

SPIRALING OF LATTICE APPROXIMATIONS

J. S. ATHREYA, ANISH GHOSH, AND JIMMY TSENG

ABSTRACT. In this paper we announce an equidistribution result for certain Siegel transforms on $\mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$. These results date back to the work of Eskin-Margulis-Mozes and have wide-ranging applications. We explore a particular application of our equidistribution result relating to *spiraling* of approximates of Diophantine inequalities. We show that on average, the directions of approximates spiral in a uniformly distributed fashion on the $d-1$ dimensional unit sphere. We also obtain results for approximation of higher-dimensional subspaces. On the other hand, we explicitly construct examples in which the directions are not uniformly distributed.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and for $0 \leq \epsilon < 1$ and $T > 0$ define the annular region

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{B}_T(\epsilon) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \epsilon T \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| < T\}$$

Let $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ denote the $d-1$ dimensional unit sphere centered at 0 and let Λ denote a unimodular lattice in $\mathbb{R}^d$. It is well known that asymptotically, the directions of lattice points in $\mathcal{B}_T(\epsilon)$ become *equidistributed* on $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. For a measurable subset A of $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ with boundary of measure zero,

$$(1.2) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda \cap \mathcal{B}_T(\epsilon) : \mathbf{x}/\|\mathbf{x}\| \in A\}}{\#\{\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda \cap \mathcal{B}_T(\epsilon)\}} = \mathrm{vol}(A).$$

Here vol is Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. In this paper, we are concerned with a natural variation of the equidistribution question above closely connected to Diophantine approximation.

It is a classical theorem of Dirichlet [4], that for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist infinitely many $(\mathbf{p}, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$(1.3) \quad \|q\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}\| < |q|^{-1/d}.$$

Given such an $\mathbf{x}$, we form the associated unimodular lattice in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$

$$\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id}_d & \mathbf{x} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} q\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p} \\ q \end{pmatrix} : \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^d, q \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

Then we can view the approximates $(\mathbf{p}, q)$ of $\mathbf{x}$ appearing in (1.3) as points of the lattice $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ in the region

$$(1.4) \quad R := \left\{ \mathbf{v} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} : \|\mathbf{v}_1\| |v_2|^{1/d} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37A17, 11K60, 11J70.

Key words and phrases. Diophantine approximation, continued fractions, equidistribution.

J.S.A. partially supported by NSF grant DMS 1069153.

A.G. partially supported by the Royal Society.

J.T. partially supported by ERC Advanced Grant HFAKT.

The set R is a thinning region around the v_2 -axis, and a natural question is to understand the *geometry* of the set of approximates $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \cap R$. To do so, we introduce the following sets:

$$(1.5) \quad R_{\epsilon, T} := \{\mathbf{v} \in R : \epsilon T \leq v_2 \leq T\}$$

and, for a measurable subset A of $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ with zero measure boundary,

$$(1.6) \quad R_{A, \epsilon, T} := \left\{ \mathbf{v} \in R_{\epsilon, T} : \frac{\mathbf{v}_1}{\|\mathbf{v}_1\|} \in A \right\}.$$

For a unimodular lattice Λ , define

$$N(\Lambda, \epsilon, T) = \#\{\Lambda \cap R_{\epsilon, T}\}$$

and

$$N(\Lambda, A, \epsilon, T) = \#\{\Lambda \cap R_{A, \epsilon, T}\}$$

Let dk denote Haar measure on $K = \mathrm{SO}_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$, and let $X_{d+1} = \mathrm{SL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{Z})$ denote the space of unimodular lattices in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.

Theorem 1.1. *For every $\Lambda \in X_{d+1}$, $A \subset \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ as above, and for every $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$(1.7) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_K N(k^{-1}\Lambda, A, \epsilon, T) \, dk}{\int_K N(k^{-1}\Lambda, \epsilon, T) \, dk} = \mathrm{vol}(A).$$

That is, for any lattice Λ , on average over the set of directions $\mathbf{v}$, the set of approximates satisfying Dirichlet's theorem in the direction $\mathbf{v}$ equidistributes in the set of directions $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ in the orthogonal complement to $\mathbf{v}$. If we fix the vertical, and instead average our counting functions over a range of heights, T , we have a result for almost every lattice Λ , with respect to the probability measure μ on X_{d+1} induced by Haar measure on $\mathrm{SL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$. The proof of Theorem 1.1 depends on an equidistribution result for Siegel transforms Theorem 2.2 which is proved in our companion paper [1]. Results of this flavor have a long history, beginning with the work of Eskin-Margulis-Mozes [7] and have wide ranging Diophantine applications. More applications of Theorem 2.2 appear in [1].

Theorem 1.2. *Fix $A \subset \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ as above. For μ -almost every $\Lambda \in X_{d+1}$ and for every $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$(1.8) \quad \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^S N(\Lambda, A, \epsilon, e^t) \, dt}{\int_0^S N(\Lambda, \epsilon, e^t) \, dt} = \mathrm{vol}(A).$$

That is, if we average the number of approximates in the region A over a range of heights and similarly average the total number of approximates, we have an almost everywhere equidistribution. On the other hand, we construct explicit examples of lattices Λ and directions $\mathbf{v}$ for which (non-averaged) equidistribution does not hold.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $d \geq 1$. There exists a lattice $\Lambda \in \mathrm{SL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{Z})$, a set $A \subset \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ with zero measure boundary, and a sequence $\{T_n\}$ for which*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(\Lambda, A, \epsilon, T_n)}{N(\Lambda, \epsilon, T_n)} \neq \mathrm{vol}(A)$$

for every $1 > \epsilon \geq 0$.

For $d = 1$, note that $\mathbb{S}^0 := \{-1, 1\}$ and we define $\text{vol}(\{-1\}) = \text{vol}(\{1\}) = 1/2$.

Acknowledgements: This work was initiated during a visit by A. Ghosh to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He thanks the department for its hospitality. J. Athreya would like to thank Yale University for its hospitality in the 2012-13 academic year, when this work was completed. He would also like to thank G. Margulis for useful discussions.

2. THE SPACE OF LATTICES

In this section, we show how to reduce the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 to equidistribution problems on the space of lattices. Theorem 1.2 is a consequence of this reduction and the Birkhoff ergodic theorem, which gives us almost everywhere equidistribution of trajectories for diagonal flows. For Theorem 1.1, our ergodic tool Theorem 2.2 will be of independent interest, as it gives equidistribution of Siegel transforms for quite general functions. We recall the definition of Siegel transform: given a lattice Λ in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and a bounded function f with compact support on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, denote by $\hat{f}$ its *Siegel transform*:

$$\hat{f}(\Lambda) := \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \Lambda} f(\mathbf{v}).$$

Recall that μ is the measure induced by Haar measure on $SL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ on the quotient $X_{d+1} = SL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})/SL_{d+1}(\mathbb{Z})$ (normalized to be a probability measure). We recall the classical Siegel Mean Value Theorem [14]:

Theorem 2.1. *Let f be as above. Then $\hat{f} \in L^1(X_{d+1}, \mu)$ and*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} f \, d\mathbf{v} = \int_{X_{d+1}} \hat{f} \, d\mu.$$

Note that if f is the indicator function of a set A , then $\hat{f}(\Lambda)$ is simply the number of points in $\Lambda \cap A$. Let

$$g_t := \begin{pmatrix} e^t \text{Id}_d & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-dt} \end{pmatrix} \in SL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R}).$$

Note that if we set t so that $e^{dt} = T$, we have

$$g_t R_{\epsilon, T} = R_{\epsilon, 1} := R_{\epsilon}$$

and

$$g_t R_{A, \epsilon, T} = R_{A, \epsilon, 1} := R_{A, \epsilon}.$$

We write $\mathbf{1}_{A, \epsilon, T}$ for the characteristic function of $R_{A, \epsilon, T}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\epsilon, T}$ for the characteristic function of $R_{\epsilon, T}$, and drop the subscript when $T = 1$.

In view of the above discussions, we have

$$(2.1) \quad N(\Lambda, A, \epsilon, e^t) = \hat{\mathbf{1}}_{R_{A, \epsilon}}(g_t/d\Lambda)$$

$$(2.2) \quad N(k^{-1}\Lambda, A, \epsilon, T) = \hat{\mathbf{1}}_{R_{A, \epsilon}}(g_t k\Lambda)$$

Integrating these formulas with respect to t and k respectively, we obtain

$$(2.3) \quad \int_0^S N(\Lambda, A, \epsilon, e^t) dt = \int_0^S \hat{\mathbf{1}}_{R_{A, \epsilon}}(g_t/d\Lambda) dt$$

$$(2.4) \quad \int_K N(k^{-1}\Lambda, A, \epsilon, T) dk = \int_K \widehat{\mathbf{1}}_{R_{A,\epsilon}}(g_t k \Lambda) dk$$

2.1. Time-averaged spiraling. In this section we prove Theorem 1.2. Moore's ergodicity theorem (see, for example, [2]) states that the action of g_t on X_{d+1} is ergodic, so by the Birkhoff ergodic theorem, for any $h \in L^1(X_{d+1}, \mu)$, we have, for almost every $\Lambda \in X_{d+1}$,

$$\lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^S h(g_t \Lambda) dt = \int_{X_{d+1}} h d\mu.$$

By Siegel's mean value formula, the functions $\widehat{\mathbf{1}}_{R_{A,\epsilon}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{1}}_{R_\epsilon}$ are in $L^1(\mu)$. Applying the Birkhoff theorem to these functions (and taking the intersection of the full measure sets obtained), and combining with (2.3), we obtain Theorem 1.2. $\square$

2.2. Equidistribution of Siegel transforms. By equation (2.4), to prove Theorem 1.1, we need to show the equidistribution of the Siegel transforms of the sets $R_{A,\epsilon}$ and R_ϵ with respect to the integrals over g_t -translates of K . Our main ergodic tool in this setting is then.

Theorem 2.2. *Let f be a bounded function of compact support on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Then for any $\Lambda \in X_{d+1}$,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_K \widehat{f}(g_t k x) dk = \int_{X_{d+1}} \widehat{f} d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} f(\mathbf{v}) d\mathbf{v}.$$

The proof of the Theorem, and more applications follow in our companion paper [1]. We note that the above theorem is reminiscent of [7, Theorem 3.4] of Eskin-Margulis-Mozes, but the compact group and the one-parameter diagonal subgroup used there are different. The philosophy of our proof, however, is very similar. We will give upper and lower bounds for the integral. The lower bounds follow immediately by applying the following equidistribution theorem (Theorem 2.3) of Duke, Rudnick and Sarnak (cf. [5]) (a simpler proof was given by Eskin and McMullen [8] using mixing and generalized by Shah [12]) and then approximating the Siegel transform f from below by $h \in C_c(X_{d+1})$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let G be a non-compact semisimple Lie group and let K be a maximal compact subgroup of G . Let Γ be a lattice in G and let ν be any probability measure on K which is absolutely continuous with respect to a Haar measure on K . Let $\{a_n\}$ be a sequence of elements of G without accumulation points. Then for any $x \in G/\Gamma$ and any $h \in C_c(G/\Gamma)$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_K h(a_n k x) d\nu(k) = \int_{G/\Gamma} h d\lambda.$$

The more technical upper bound will follow the strategy of [7], see also [6] and involves delicate considerations involving systems of inequalities on X_{d+1} .

2.2.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1. Applying Theorem 2.2 to $R_{A,\epsilon}$ and R_ϵ we obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_K \widehat{\mathbf{1}}_{R_{A,\epsilon}}(g_t k \Lambda) d\nu(k) = \int_{X_{d+1}} \widehat{\mathbf{1}}_{R_{A,\epsilon}} d\mu = \text{vol}(R_{A,\epsilon})$$

where we have applied Siegel's mean value theorem in the last equality. We apply this to numerator as well as denominator in (1.7) to get

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_K N(k^{-1}\Lambda, A, \epsilon, T) \, dk}{\int_K N(k^{-1}\Lambda, \epsilon, T) \, dk} = \frac{\text{vol}(R_{A, \epsilon})}{\text{vol}(R_\epsilon)} = \text{vol}(A).$$

which finishes the proof. $\square$

3. NON-UNIFORM SPIRALING

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3 by using continued fractions to construct a family of one-dimensional examples for which the directions are not uniformly distributed. For higher dimensions, we use non-minimal toral translations as examples.

We can strengthen the conclusion of Theorem 1.3:

Theorem 3.1. *Let $d \geq 1$. There exists a lattice $\Lambda \in \text{SL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})/\text{SL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{Z})$ and a set A of $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ for which*

$$\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{\Lambda \cap R_{A, \epsilon, T}\}}{\#\{\Lambda \cap R_{\epsilon, T}\}} > \text{vol}(A)$$

and

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{\Lambda \cap R_{-A, \epsilon, T}\}}{\#\{\Lambda \cap R_{\epsilon, T}\}} < \text{vol}(A)$$

for every $1 > \epsilon \geq 0$.

3.1. Proof of Theorems 1.3 and 3.1 in dimension one. We prove Theorem 3.1, which also suffices to show Theorem 1.3. We must construct a lattice in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and pick a set A of $\mathbb{S}^0$ for that lattice. Let

$$A = \{-1\}.$$

To construct the lattice, we construct a number $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ using continued fractions (see [9] for an introduction) and form the associated unimodular lattice Λ_x . At the end, we will note that our method of construction provides a family of numbers, corresponding to a family of lattices, which satisfy the theorem. Using an analogous construction allows us to consider $A = \{1\}$ too.

Let x be the irrational number between zero and one for which

$$a_n := \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\ n^n & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

is the n th continued fraction element (note $n \geq 1$). Since x is irrational, there is a unique $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ for which $|qx - p| < 1/2$, which, by forgetting p , we can regard as a rotation of the circle $[0, 1]/0 \sim 1$. And therefore the only lattice points that matter for the region R from (1.4) are those $(p, q) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ coming from the rotation. Also, since the negation of a lattice point in R stays in R , we may, without loss of generality, consider lattice points with $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Finally, since x is positive, our lattice points will have $p \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

For some pairs of such (p, q) , the ratio $\frac{qx-p}{\|qx-p\|}$ will be 1 and for others -1 , which is equivalent to asking whether (p, q) is on one or the other side of the ray starting at the origin and going through $(x, 1)^T$, which is equivalent to asking whether $qx - p > 0$ or $qx - p < 0$, and which, if, for conciseness, we introduce the notation

$$q \cdot x$$

to denote the circle rotation above, is equivalent to asking whether $q \cdot x > 0$ or $q \cdot x < 0$.

Let p_n/q_n denote the n th convergent of x . We will use the following well-known facts about continued fractions and circle rotations:

- (1) The rotations $q_{n-1} \cdot x$ and $q_n \cdot x$ alternate in sign.
- (2)

$$\begin{aligned} p_n &= a_n p_{n-1} + p_{n-2} \\ q_n &= a_n q_{n-1} + q_{n-2} \end{aligned}$$

- (3)

$$q_n p_{n-1} - p_n q_{n-1} = -1^n$$

- (4)

$$\frac{1}{q_n + q_{n+1}} < |q_n \cdot x| < \frac{1}{q_{n+1}}$$

- (5) Convergents are best approximates (of the second kind):

$$|q_n \cdot x| < |q \cdot x|$$

for all $0 < q < q_{n+1}$.

The following is a general fact of the continued fraction of any irrational number:

Lemma 3.2. *We have*

$$\frac{a_{n+1}}{2} < \frac{|q_{n-1} \cdot x|}{|q_n \cdot x|} < a_{n+1} + 2.$$

Proof. Both inequalities follow from Facts (2) and (4). □

For our particular number x , the lemma implies that

Corollary 3.3. *For n , an even number, we have*

$$2 < \frac{|q_{n-1} \cdot x|}{|q_n \cdot x|} < 6$$

and, for n , an odd number, we have

$$\frac{(n+1)^{n+1}}{2} < \frac{|q_{n-1} \cdot x|}{|q_n \cdot x|} < (n+1)^{n+1} + 2.$$

Since $x < 1/2$, we have that $1 \cdot x > 0$. Using facts about continued fractions, the usual conventions $q_{-1} = 0$, $p_{-1} = 1$, and that $p_0 = 0$ by construction, it follows that $q_0 = 1$. Consequently,

Lemma 3.4. *For n , an even integer, we have*

$$q_n \cdot x > 0$$

and, for n , an odd integer, we have

$$q_n \cdot x < 0.$$

Proof. As noted, $q_0 \cdot x > 0$. Fact (1) immediately implies the result. □

Since the denominators of the convergents are strictly increasing, Fact (4) implies that (p_n, q_n) are in R and that, for n large enough, $q_n \cdot x$ is itself a rotation by a small angle (much smaller than angle x). However, there are other lattice points in R , which we now describe.

We will count relevant lattice points by induction; it is convenient to induct on n , the index of the convergents. Since we are considering a limit, we may start counting lattice points

starting with some large q_n without affecting our result. Therefore, we may assume that $\frac{1}{q_n}$ is small.

We are interested in lattice points in R . Recall that these lattice points come from the above-mentioned rotations and hence lattice points in R are equivalent to rotations $q \cdot x$ for which $|q \cdot x| \leq \frac{1}{q}$. To help us count, let us enlarge the lattices points of interest to those corresponding to

$$|q \cdot x| \leq \frac{1}{q_n}$$

for $q_n \leq q < q_{n+1}$ and exclude those not in R . It follows from Fact (4) that the only lattices points of relevance from those corresponding to $0 \leq q < q_n$ are q_{n-1} and $2q_{n-1}$ on one side of 0, 0 itself, and one on the other side of 0, which we will say corresponds to $\tilde{q}$ —since convergents are best approximates, we know that $|\tilde{q} \cdot x| > |q_{n-1} \cdot x|$.

For the initial step of the induction on n , we have chosen to ignore the lattice points corresponding to q_{n-1} , $2q_{n-1}$, 0, and $\tilde{q}$ and, for an induction step, we have already counted the contribution from these points. It the in-between lattice points corresponding to $q_n \leq q < q_{n+1}$ that concern us. The division algorithm describes all such lattice points as follows: $q = mq_n + r$. The only remainders r of interest are the ones already chosen. By Fact (2) applied to x , there are always at least three in-between points—to be precise, these in-between points for a given remainder r correspond to $\{q_n + r, 2q_n + r, 3q_n + r, \dots\}$. Moreover, the number of in-between points is either $a_{n+1} - 1$ or a_{n+1} depending on the remainder r . If $r_1 \cdot x$ and $r_2 \cdot x$ are adjacent on the circle for $0 \leq r_1 \neq r_2 < q_n$, then their in-between lattice points divides the interval formed by $r_1 \cdot x$ and $r_2 \cdot x$ up into equal length pieces with the sole exception of one piece which may be slightly longer—this observation follows from Fact (1) and the fact that convergents are best approximates and rotations are isometries.

Let us consider these in-between points. We claim that the only in-between point for the remainder $r = \tilde{q}$ that may be relevant corresponds to $q_n + \tilde{q}$. First note that, by Fact (1), that $|(mq_n + \tilde{q}) \cdot x| > |(\ell q_n + \tilde{q}) \cdot x|$ for $a_{n+1} > m > \ell \geq 0$. For $m \geq 2$, we have

$$|(mq_n + \tilde{q}) \cdot x| > \frac{1}{2q_n}$$

by Fact (4), but we also have

$$\frac{1}{mq_n + \tilde{q}} < \frac{1}{2q_n},$$

which shows our claim. The lattice point corresponding to $q_n + \tilde{q}$ is only one point and may be ignored for the limit that we are computing.

We claim that the only in-between point for remainder $r = 2q_{n-1}$ that may be relevant corresponds to $q_n + 2q_{n-1}$. The proof is analogous to that for $\tilde{q}$. And the possible relevant lattice point can be ignored for the limit.

For the remaining two remainders, the behaviors differ greatly (by construction) for odd-indexed and even-indexed convergents; we consider these cases separately.

3.1.1. Odd-indexed convergents. Let n be odd. We will show that many of the in-between lattice points for the remainder 0 are in R , while very few of the in-between lattice points for remainder q_{n-1} are. Let us first consider the in-between points for q_{n-1} , which correspond to $\{mq_n + q_{n-1}\}$ for $0 < m < a_{n+1}$ by Fact (2). By Lemma 3.4, we have

$$0 < (mq_n + q_{n-1}) \cdot x < (\ell q_n + q_{n-1}) \cdot x < q_{n-1} \cdot x$$

for $0 < \ell < m < a_{n+1}$. Note that we have exactly $M := a_{n+1} - 1$ in-between points between $q_{n-1} \cdot x$ and 0 in the given range. Since circle rotation by x is an abelian group, these in-between points divide up the interval between 0 and $q_{n-1} \cdot x$ into equal length segments, except for the segment with 0 as an endpoint, which is slightly longer. Thus, we have

$$(3.1) \quad q_{n-1} \cdot x - \frac{m}{M+1}(q_{n-1} \cdot x) < (mq_n + q_{n-1}) \cdot x$$

for $0 < m \leq M$. Now to be excluded from R , a lattice point must satisfy the following condition

$$\frac{1}{mq_n + q_{n-1}} < (mq_n + q_{n-1}) \cdot x,$$

which is satisfied, as one can see by applying Fact (4) to (3.1), if the point satisfies

$$\frac{1}{mq_n} < \frac{1}{2q_n} \left(1 - \frac{m}{M+1} \right).$$

The latter condition, in turn, is equivalent to asking at which values of m is the parabola $-m^2 + (M+1)m - 2(M+1) > 0$. The answer is between the two roots, which, for M large enough, are as close as we like to 2 and $M-1$. Since n is odd, M can be chosen large. Thus, except, possibly, for four in-between points, the rest are excluded from R . We can ignore these four points for computing the limit.

Finally, to finish the odd-indexed case, we consider in-between points for 0. There are $N := a_{n+1}$ of such points in the given range (which divide up the segment between $\tilde{q} \cdot x$ and 0 into equal length pieces, except for a slightly longer piece with endpoint $\tilde{q} \cdot x$). From (3.1), we have that

$$(3.2) \quad -\frac{m}{N}(q_{n-1} \cdot x) < (mq_n) \cdot x$$

for $0 < m < N$. Now for a lattice point to be in R , we need the following condition to hold:

$$-\frac{1}{mq_n} \leq (mq_n) \cdot x,$$

which is satisfied, as one can see by applying Fact (4) to (3.2), if the point satisfies

$$-\frac{1}{mq_n} \leq -\frac{m}{q_n N}.$$

Let L_n be the number of in-between lattice points for remainder 0 in R . Our calculation implies that $L_n \geq \lfloor (n+1)^{(n+1)/2} \rfloor$.

3.1.2. Even-indexed convergents. For any remainder, there are at most $a_{n+1} = 4$ in-between points. All of these can be ignored in the limit calculation.

3.1.3. Finishing the proof of Theorem 3.1. Thus, the lattice points that project onto A have count $\sum (L_{2k+1} + P_1)$ where P_1 is a natural number ≤ 5 . While, all lattice points in R have count $\sum (L_{2k+1} + P_2)$ where P_2 is a natural number ≤ 10 . It is clear that fixing an ϵ does not affect the proceeding. Therefore, we have shown that

$$\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{\Lambda \cap R_{A,\epsilon,T}\}}{\#\{\Lambda \cap R_{\epsilon,T}\}} = 1$$

and

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{\Lambda \cap R_{-A,\epsilon,T}\}}{\#\{\Lambda \cap R_{\epsilon,T}\}} = 0.$$

The theorem is now immediate.

3.2. Other numbers that satisfy Theorem 3.1 in dimension one. It is clear that our construction of x via continued fractions in the proof of Theorem 3.1 is a general construction. Let $a_n(x_1)$ and $a_n(x_2)$ be the n -th elements of the continued fraction expansions of x_1 and x_2 , respectively. Then we define $x_1 \# x_2$ to be the continued fraction whose elements are

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2n}(x_1 \# x_2) &:= a_n(x_1) \\ a_{2n+1}(x_1 \# x_2) &:= a_n(x_2) \end{aligned}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Since continued fractions are unique, the operation $\#$ is a well-defined (non-commutative) product of real numbers, which we refer to as the *continued fraction product*. It is clear from our construction above that, to satisfy the theorem, the number $x_1 \# x_2$ must have $a_n(x_2)$ grow faster than $a_n(x_1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let us refer to such numbers as *unbalanced*.

Finally, reversing the order of the continued fraction product for our constructed number x will provide an example of a number satisfying the theorem for $A = \{1\}$.

3.3. Proof of Theorems 1.3 and 3.1 in higher dimensions. We use the well-known fact:

Lemma 3.5. *The toral translation by a vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)^T$ is non-minimal if and only if there exist integers $k_1, \dots, k_d$ not all zero such that $\sum k_i x_i \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

This example is a simple observation. Let $d \geq 1$. Let $\mathbf{x}$ correspond to a non-minimal toral translation. Then, it follows that there is a primitive integer lattice vector $\mathbf{v}$ perpendicular (with respect to the usual dot product in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$) to the $d+1$ -vector $(\mathbf{x}^T, 1)^T$. And $\mathbf{v} \neq (0, \dots, 0, 1)^T$. Changing the basis of $\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}$ to $\{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{d+1}\}$ allows us to see that $(\mathbf{x}^T, 1)^T$ lies in the $X := \text{span}\{\mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{d+1}\}$ (thought of as a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$). Now it follows that the basis vectors $\{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{d+1}\}$ determine a parallelepiped of $d+1$ -volume equal to 1. Hence it follows that the only lattice points of $\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}$ closer to $(\mathbf{x}^T, 1)^T$ than the Euclidean distance between $\mathbf{v}$ and X must lie on X .

Now let $Y := \text{span}\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_d\}$ (thought of as a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$). The spaces X and Y do not coincide because their normal vectors are not in the same direction. Therefore $X \cap Y \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}$ is a proper sublattice of $X \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}$ and hence no lattice points in the thinning region R (after becoming thin enough) project onto $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ outside of this sublattice—the projection is onto a lower dimensional sphere $\mathbb{S}^{d-2}$. This proves the theorem for $d \geq 2$.

For $d = 1$, we note that the $(x, 1)^T$ is a rational vector and hence goes through an point of $\mathbb{Z}^2$. It is easy to see that all integer lattice points close enough to $(x, 1)^T$ lie on the line through it—in this case, there is no projection at all. This proves the theorem for $d = 1$.

We conclude by remarking that an exaggerated version of the preceding example is given by taking the unbalanced number x constructed in the proof of Theorem 3.1 in dimension one and forming $\mathbf{x} = (x, \dots, x)^T$. This gives a higher dimensional example satisfying Theorem 3.1.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. S. Athreya, Anish Ghosh and Jimmy Tseng, *Equidistribution of Siegel transforms and applications*, in preparation.
- [2] B. Bekka and M. Mayer, *Ergodic Theory and Topological Dynamics of group actions on homogeneous spaces*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

- [3] S. G. Dani, *Divergent trajectories of flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation*. J. Reine Angew. Math. 359 (1985), 55–89.
- [4] L. G. P. Dirichlet, *Veral lgemeinerung eines Satzes aus der Lehre von den Ket- tenbrüchen nebst einige Anwendungen auf die Theorie der Zahlen*, S.-B. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. (1842), 93–95.
- [5] W. Duke, Z. Rudnick, and P. Sarnak. Density of integer points on affine homo- geneous varieties. Duke Math. J., 71(1):143–179, 1993.
- [6] A. Eskin and G. Margulis, *Recurrence Properties of Random Walks on Finite Volume Homogeneous Manifolds*, Random walks and geometry, 431–444, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2004.
- [7] A. Eskin, G. Margulis and S. Mozes, *Upper bounds and asymptotics in a quantitative version of the Oppenheim conjecture*, Ann. of Math. 147 (1998), no. 1, 93–141.
- [8] A. Eskin and C. McMullen, *Mixing, counting, and equidistribution in Lie groups*, Duke Math. J., 71(1):181–209, 1993.
- [9] A. Khinchin, “Continued Fractions,” The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1964.
- [10] D. Kleinbock and G. Margulis, *Logarithm laws for flows on homogeneous spaces*, Invent. Math., 138 (1999), 451–494.
- [11] D. Kleinbock, N. Shah and A. Starkov, *Dynamics of subgroup actions on homogeneous spaces of Lie groups and applications to number theory*, In Handbook of dynamical systems, Vol. 1A, pages 813–930. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002.
- [12] Nimish Shah, *Limit distributions of expanding translates of certain orbits on homogeneous spaces*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci., Math. Sci. 106 (1996) 105–125.
- [13] W. Schmidt, *Asymptotic formulae for point lattices of bounded determinant and subspaces of bounded height*, Duke Math J. 35 (1968), 327–339.
- [14] C. S. Siegel, *A mean value theorem in geometry of numbers*, Ann. Math. 46 (1945), 340–347.

E-mail address: jathreya@iilinois.edu

E-mail address: a.ghosh@uea.ac.uk

E-mail address: j.tseng@bristol.ac.uk

J.S.A.: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, 1409 W. GREEN STREET, URBANA, IL 61801, USA

A.G.: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA, NORWICH, NR4 7TJ UK

J.T.: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, UNIVERSITY WALK, BRISTOL, BS8 1TW UK